DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 502 EC 142 161

AUTHOR Davis, Paul I.; Parks, Anita Todd
TITLE Gifted and Talented Workshop: Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Ypsilanti Public Schools, Mich.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; Program Evaluation; *Talent; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

The report evaluates a 10 day workshop for seven teachers, parents, and community leaders on gifted and talented education. Workshop objectives centered on knowledge regarding the behaviors, needs, identification, and programing of gifted/talented students. A summary of each of the 10 day's activities and major resources used is provided. Daily topics included definitions, giftedness among disadvantaged students, goals of education, aspects of creativity, games and gaming, and program alternatives. Evaluation results are reported for pre- and postmeasures of knowledge and cognitive growth, evaluations of speakers, and overall evaluation listing strengths and weaknesses. Appended are participants list, agenda, and sample evaluation instruments. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215502

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EVALUATION REPORT

GIFTED AND TALENTED WORKSHOP

August 18-29, 1980

Ypsilanti Public Schools

~

Sponsored and facilitated by:

Title VII Office
Ypsilanti Public Schools
Paul I. Davis, Coordinator

Workshop coordinator:

Anita Todd Parks
Consultant for Gifted
Washtenaw Intermediate School District

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul I. Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC142161

WORKSHOP: GIFTED AND TALENTED
August 18-29, 1980

FACILITATED AND SPONSORED BY: Title VII Office
Ypsilanti Public Schools
Paul Davis, Coordinator

WORKSHOP COORDINATOR: Anita Todd Parks
Consultant for Gifted
Washtenaw Intermediate School District

GOAL: To provide participants with knowledge and training that will involve them in support of local efforts for the gifted as well as to aid in the process of identifying gifted students, particularly those from minority or disadvantaged backgrounds.

CONTENT OBJECTIVES:

1. To become knowledgeable of and sensitive to the behaviors of gifted, talented and creative children.

2. To become knowledgeable of and sensitive to the educational, social and emotional needs of the disadvantaged gifted.

3. To explore methods of identifying gifted and disadvantaged gifted children.

4. To explore methods of providing for the education of the gifted:

    a.) administrative provisions
    b.) curricular considerations
    c.) instructional strategies

GIFTED AND TALENTED WORKSHOP

EVALUATION REPORT

Background and Purpose

The Title VII Office of the Ypsilanti Public Schools, Paul I. Davis, Coordinator, sponsored and facilitated a Workshop on Gifted and Talented for teachers, parents and community leaders from August 18 through August 29, 1980. The goal of the Workshop was to provide participants with knowledge and training that would involve them in support of local efforts for the gifted as well as to aid in the process of identifying gifted students, particularly those from minority or disadvantaged backgrounds.

The Workshop participants met from 8:30-11:30 a.m. daily for a total of 30 contact hours. All sessions were held at the Ypsilanti Community Center Building, 210 W. Cross, Ypsilanti.

Sessions were conducted by the Workshop coordinator, Anita Todd Parks, Consultant for Gifted and Talented, Washtenaw Intermediate School District, and three guest speakers: Annemarie Roeper, Roeper City and Country School for Gifted Children, Bloomfield Hills; Gloria Downing, Livingston Intermediate School District, Howell; and Barbara Lavery, Lincoln Consolidated Schools. The Project FOCUS teacher, Cheryl Wilbanks, also presented an overview of past and current efforts for identified students in grades 1-6. A Workshop agenda and a list of participants is provided in Appendix A.

Content objectives of the workshop were: 1) to become knowledgeable of and sensitive to the behaviors of gifted, talented, and creative children; 2) to become knowledgeable and sensitive to the educational, social and emotional needs of the disadvantaged gifted; 3) to explore methods of identifying gifted and disadvantaged gifted children; 4) to explore methods of providing for the education of the gifted--administrative, curricular, and instructional.

Workshop Overview

The workshop was conducted in an informal, relaxed and open style. Coffee and donuts were available throughout each session. Participants were encouraged to raise questions or comments at any point and to feel comfortable in doing so.

Major points covered by the workshop leader at each session were synthesized in one to two-page handouts provided to participants for notetaking or later reference. Brief articles on selected topics were provided from time to time for further study or for group examination and discussion. Several compiled bibliographies were also provided and reference books were made available throughout the two-week workshop. A looseleaf notebook was provided to each participant in which to keep all workshop handout materials.

A summary of each day's activities and major resources used follows.

Day 1. Participants were welcomed and given essential information: time frame, location of restrooms, informal nature of the workshop, freedom to question at any point, refreshments available throughout. Self-introductions were given in round robin fashion beginning with the workshop leader (name, occupation, family, interest in gifted, etc.).

Participants were engaged in a "warm-up" activity. The name of a well-known and universally recognized gifted person, contemporary or historic, was pinned to the back of each person. Each participant was allowed to ask three yes or no questions of each other participant in order to identify the name attached to their own back. (Names included Louis Armstrong, Eubie Blake, Walt Disney, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, Arthur Fiedler, Helen Keller, Martin Luther King, Abraham Lincoln, Pablo Picasso, Harriet Tubman.)

A workshop agenda and goals and objectives statements were distributed to participants. Each was given a looseleaf binder with a name label to facilitate collection of materials throughout the workshop.

Participants were asked to fill out the awareness level assessment forms (see Appendix B) and to respond to the agree/disagree statements from page 9 of the study guide to accompany the film "Children of Promise." (See below.) Assessment forms were collected and the agree/disagree statements were put aside for follow-up discussion.

The film "Children of Promise" was shown, followed by discussion based on the agree/disagree statements.

A brief historical overview of gifted education was presented by the workshop leader.

Resources:

Children of Promise. 16 mm film, 25 min., color. Iowa State Education Association, n.d.

Children of Promise - Educator-Community-Parent Instructional Packet. Iowa State Department of Education, n.d.

Tannenbaum, Abraham J., "Pre-Sputnik to Post-Watergate Concern About the Gifted," in The Gifted and Talented: Their Education and Development, 78th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, ed. A. Harry Passow. University of Chicago Press, 1979, pp. 5-27.

Witty, Paul A., "The Education of the Gifted and the Creative in the U.S.A.", in Psychology and Education of the Gifted, eds. Walter B. Barbe and Joseph S. Renzulli. Irvington, 1975, pp. 39-47.

Day 2. The film "It's Cool to Be Smart" was shown. Discussion following gave participants an opportunity to compare and contrast this film with "Children of Promise" and to formulate their own definitions of "gifted" and "talented".

In small groups, participants were asked to generate a list of characteristics of gifted based on their own experience with a person or persons they considered to be gifted. These lists were subsequently shared in whole group. Similarities and exceptions were noted. Though gifted persons share many traits in common, the uniqueness of each was stressed.

The workshop leader presented the various ways the terms "gifted" and "talented" are used, both in the literature and by the general public. The current U.S. Office of Education definition was also examined and discussed.

Annemarie Roeper, founder and former Headmistress of the Lower School, Roeper City and Country School, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, spoke to the group on characterics of gifted children based on her years of experience.

Resources:

It's Cool to Be Smart. 16 mm film, 25 min., color. McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Roeper, Annemarie. "The Young Gifted Child," in Gifted Child Quarterly, vol. 20, no. 3, Fall 1977, pp. 388-96.

Torrance, E. Paul. "Emerging Concepts of Giftedness," in Psychology and Education of the Gifted, eds. Walter B. Barbe and Joseph S. Renzulli. Irvington, 1975, pp. 48-55.

Gallagher, James J. Teaching the Gifted Child. Allyn & Bacon, 1975, pp. 9-16.

Day 3. "Rafe", a film on developing giftedness in the disadvantaged, was shown. Discussion which followed centered on differing expectations and recognition of talent beyond the stereotypes as well as the importance of the recognition of talent by others.

An historical view of disadvantaged gifted was given by the workshop leader. Characteristics of disadvantaged gifted were examined and discussed based on handouts from the literature and individual and collective personal experiences. Additional handouts were given for follow-up readings.

Resources:

Blanning, Jean M. "A Journey With Curtis," in Talents and Gifts, vol. 18, no. 1, November 1975, pp. 5-15.

Davis, Paul I. "Community-Based Efforts to Increase the Identification of the Number of Gifted Minority Children." Eastern Michigan University, 1978.

Frasier, Mary M. "Rethinking the Issues Regarding the Culturally Disadvantaged Gifted," in Exceptional Children, vol. 35, no. 2, 1968, pp. 135-140.

Gallagher, James J. Teaching the Gifted Child. Allyn and Bacon, 1975, pp. 367-387.

Rafe. 16 mm film, 25 min., color. National Education Association, 1966.

Renzulli, Joseph S. "Talent Potential in Minority Group Students," in Psychology and Education of the Gifted, eds. Walter B. Barbe and Joseph S. Renzulli. Irvington, 1975, pp. 411-423.

Sato, Irving S. "The Culturally Different Gifted Child--The Dawning of His Day," in Exceptional Children, vol. 40, no. 8, May 1974, pp. 572-576.

Tittle, Bess. "Searching for Hidden Treasure: Seeking the Culturally Different Gifted Child," in Journal for the Education of the Gifted, vol. 2, no. 2, Winter 1979.

Torrance, E. Paul. "Creative Positives of Disadvantaged Children and Youth," in Gifted Child Quarterly, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 71-81.

Torrance, E. Paul. Discovery and Nurturance of Giftedness in the Culturally Different. Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Day 4. Gloria Downing, Gifted Education Consultant, Livingston Intermediate School District, Howell, Michigan, conducted this session on Identification: Test and Non-Test Measures. Participants were engaged in self-identification through gaming challenges; theories important to identification procedures were discussed (definitions, view of intelligence, provisions and programming); an overview of identification procedures was given (screening, selection, placement). A variety of screening devices were examined including use of tests, observation, product/performance, matrix. Procedures for final selection and placement were discussed.

Resources:

Gallagher, James J. Teaching the Gifted Child. Allyn and Bacon, 1975, pp. 5-89.

Gowan, John C. "Identifying Gifted Students for a Program," in North Carolina Association for the Gifted and Talented Quarterly Journal, vol. 1, no. 3., pp. 23-25.

Khatena, Joe. "Something About Myself: A Brief Screening Device for Identifying Creatively Gifted Children and Adults," in Gifted Child Quarterly, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 262-266.

Martinson, Ruth A. The Identification of the Gifted and Talented. Ventura County Superintendent of Schools, 1974.

Renzulli, Joseph S., et al. Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students. Creative Learning Press, 1977.

Torrance, E. Paul. "Non-Test Indicators of Creative Talent Among Disadvantaged Children," in Gifted Child Quarterly, vol. 17, no. 1, 1973, pp. 3-9.

Day 5. Previous workshop session focused on activities designed to develop sensitivity to characteristics and identification of gifted and talented. The focus now shifted to program aspects--that is, what are their needs and how can we meet them in the school and community?

The workshop leader stated generally recognized goals of education and examined these in light of the needs of gifted students--cognitive, affective, social and physical.

Various program options and models were presented and discussed--acceleration, enrichment, pull-out, special classes, full-time g/t classroom cluster grouping, etc.; also Taylor's Multi-Talent Model, Renzulli's Enrichment Triad Model, Johns Hopkins' Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth, etc.

The importance of attending to students' learning abilities, interests and learning styles was brought out through discussion. Participants were engaged in assessing their own individual preferred style(s) of learning, first by thinking through and jotting down factors or conditions which influence their learning, and second, by taking a more formal learning styles inventory. Results were discussed and related to school needs of students with varied learning styles.

Resources:

Barbe, Walter B. and Renzulli, Joseph S., eds. Psychology and Education of the Gifted. Irvington, 1975, pp. 293-432.

Dunn, Rita, Kenneth Dunn and Gary E. Price. Learning Styles Inventory. Price Systems, 1978.

Dunn, Rita S., and Kenneth J. Dunn. Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles: A Practical Approach. Reston, 1978.

Educational Leadership, vol. 36, no. 4, January 1979. (Contains several articles on learning styles.)

Passow, A. Harry, ed. The Gifted and Talented: Their Education and Development, 78th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. University of Chicago Press, 1979, pp. 97-307.

Renzulli, Joseph S. The Enrichment Triad Model. Creative Learning Press, 1977.

Renzulli, Joseph S., and Linda H. Smith. Learning Styles Inventory: A Measure of Student Preference for Instructional Techniques. Creative Learning Press, 1978.

Taylor, Calvin W. "Multiple Talent Teaching," in Today's Education, vol. 63, 1974, pp. 71-74.

Day 6. The workshop leader presented information on aspects of creativity including definitions of creativity, inclusion/exclusion in definition of gifted, cognitive and affective elements of creativity, and ways of recognizing and nuturing creative thinking abilities.

Participants, in small groups, were engaged in a problem scenario and worked through the Osborne-Parnes creative problem solving process to arrive at a solution(s). Results were shared and the process was examined through discussion.

Guilford's Structure of the Intellect was introduced to the participants and related to the issues of types of intelligence and convergent/divergent thinking abilities.

Resources:

Gowan, John C. ed. Educating the Ablest: A Book of Readings on the Education of Gifted Children. F.E. Peacock, 1979.

Guilford, J.P. The Nature of Human Intelligence. McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Guilford, J.P. Way Beyond the IQ. Creative Education Foundation, 1977.

Khatena, Joe. The Creatively Gifted Child: Suggestions for Parents and Teachers. Vantage Press, 1978.

Parnes, Sidney J. "CPSI: The General System," in Journal of Creative Behavior, vol. 11, no. 1, 1977, pp. 1-11.

Torrance, E. Paul. Creative Learning and Teaching. Dodd Mead, 1973.

Torrance, E. Paul. "Interscholastic Brainstorming and Creative Problem Solving Competition for the Creatively Gifted," in Gifted Child Quarterly, vol. 18, no. 1, 1974, pp. 3-7.

Day 7. Instructional strategies appropriate for gifted students was the topic for this day's session. Three were experienced and examined--eliciting higher level thinking via Bloom's Taxonomy; teaching for critical thinking; and the inquiry process teaching method. For each of these, a modeling lesson utilizing the strategy was conducted by the workshop leader (workshop leader in the role of teacher, participants in the role of students), followed by discussion and examination of the strategy. Applications for use with gifted students beyond the model teaching sample were explored.

Resources:

Bloom, Benjamin S., ed. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. McKay, 1956.

Harnadek, Anita. Critical Thinking, Book 1. Midwest, 1976.

McCollum, John A. Ah Hah! The Inquiry Process of Generating and Testing Knowledge. Goodyear, 1978.

Sanders, Norris M. Classroom Questions: What Kinds? Harper and Row, 1966.

Day 8. This session on Program Options for Gifted was conducted by Barbara Lavery, Gifted Coordinator, Lincoln Consolidated School District, Michigan. The Lincoln district is contiguous to the Ypsilanti district and the two districts share similarities in their demography. The several options for gifted in the Lincoln district were shared along with their historical development and rationale. These have developed over time as students were identified and their diverse needs recognized.

A demonstration of games and gaming, used in one component of Lincoln's program, was carried out by a student who accompanied Ms. Lavery.

Day 9. An overview of Project Focus, the Ypsilanti School District's program for gifted and talented, was provided by Cheryl Wilbanks, Focus Teacher. Developmental history, identification procedures, and program elements were discussed.

During the second half of the session, additional instructional strategies appropriate for gifted were examined. The workshop leader demonstrated an application of the Taba strategy for concept development. Synectics and the Future Problem Solving Program were described. Applications for gifted students were discussed.

Resources:

Institute for Staff Development. Hilda Taba Teaching Strategies Program. Institute for Staff Development, 1971.

Joyce, Bruce, and Marsha Weil. Models of Teaching. Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Torrance, E. Paul, et al. Handbook for Training Future Problem Solving Teams. University of Georgia, 1977.

Day 10. This session was devoted to a wrap-up and evaluation of the total workshop. Discussion at the beginning of the session was designed to elicit any new relationships seen between ideas and information presented throughout the workshop, to respond to remaining questions from the participants, and for the workshop leader to express thanks for participants' faithful and active participation. They were, indeed, a delightful group!

Post-test instruments and evaluation forms were distributed, responded to and collected.

After a brief introduction as to its nature and purpose, the film "Why Man Creates" was shown to bring the workshop to a close.

Resources:

Why Man Creates. 16 mm film, 30 min., color. Pyramid Films, 1968.

Evaluation Design

Two instruments were used on a pre-test/post-test basis at the beginning and conclusion of the Workshop. The first was designed to assess overall knowledge and commitment to programming for gifted and talented. The second, more specific, instrument was designed to assess and measure perceptions of cognitive growth.

A speaker evaluation instrument was utilized to evaluate each of the sessions conducted by the three guest speakers.

An additional instrument was used at the conclusion of the Workshop to examine perceptions about the overall structure and impact of the Workshop. The assessment and evaluation instruments are provided in Appendix B.

Evaluation results are reported on the following pages in this order:

I. PRE/POST MEASURES ON TWO INSTRUMENTS

II. SPEAKER EVALUATIONS

III. TOTAL WORKSHOP EVALUATION

I. PRE/POST MEASURES

Two instruments were used on a pre-test/post-test basis at the beginning and conclusion of the Workshop. The first of these (see Appendix B) was to assess and measure overall knowledge and commitment to programming for gifted and talented. Nine participants completed the pre-test; six participants completed the post-test. Results are shown in Table 1.

In order to arrive at a mean, a numerical value was assigned to each response as follows: A = 1; B = 2; C = 3; D = 4; E = 5. Numbers within the grid indicate the number of responses in each category for pre/post; e.g. 0/1 indicates no responses in that category on the pre-test and one response in that category on the post-test.

Table 1

PRE/POST OF KNOWLEDGE AND COMMITMENT

	HIGH 5	4	3	2	LOW 1	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN
Level of Knowledge:							
1. concept of 'giftedness', i.e. definition, characteristics, identification	N.A.	0/1	1/5	5/0	3/0	1.8	3.1
2. rationale (philosophy) for differentiated provisions for education of G/T	N.A.	0/2	0/3	4/1	5/0	1.4	3.1
3. ways to provide quality differentiated programs for G/T	N.A.	0/1	0/4	2/1	7/0	1.2	3.0
Level of commitment?							
4. to district-wide provisions for G/T	4/6	1/0	2/0	0/0	2/0	3.6	5.0
5. to specific provisions for G/T students with whom you are directly or indirectly involved	4/6	1/0	2/0	0/0	2/0	3.6	5.0

The second pre/post instrument (see Appendix B) was to assess and measure perceptions of cognitive growth. Again, in order to arrive at a mean, a numerical value was assigned to each response on a scale of 1-4 as follows: 1-no background; 2-fair understanding; 3-fairly confident; 4-strong background. Results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

PRE/POST PERCEPTIONS OF COGNITIVE GROWTH

No background	Fair understanding	Fairly confident	Strong background			PRE MEAN	POST MEAN
2/0	7/0	0/3	0/3	1.	Characteristics of the gifted	1.8	3.5
2/0	7/0	0/2	0/4	2.	Characteristics of disadvantaged gifted	1.8	3.7
4/0	5/0	0/3	0/3	3.	Methods of identifying gifted	1.6	3.5
4/0	5/1	0/2	0/3	4.	Creativity - what it is; how fostered	1.6	3.3
6/0	2/0	1/5		5.	Bloom's Taxonomy	1.4	3.0
6/0	3/0	0/6		6.	Guilfords Structure of the Intellect	1.3	3.0
	7/0	2/4	0/2	7.	Critical thinking	2.2	3.3
	7/0	2/3	0/3	8.	Creative Problem Solving	2.2	3.5
8/0	1/1	0/5		9.	Taba strategies	1.1	2.8
1/	7/0	1/3	0/3	10.	Learning styles	2.0	3.5
1/	7/1	1/3	0/2	11.	Teaching styles	2.0	3.2
7/	1/0	1/5	0/1	12.	Renzulli's Enrichment Triad Model	1.3	3.2

II. SPEAKER EVALUATIONS

Evaluation responses to each of three outside speakers who presented workshop sessions follow in Tables 3,4, and 5. (See Appendix B for evaluation form used.)

Table 3

ANNEMARIE ROEPER'S PRESENTATION
(7 returns)

CATEGORY	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	MEAN
Organization	-	5	2	-	-	3.7
Content	1	5	1	-	-	4.0
Delivery	-	3	3	1	-	3.3
Materials	-	4	2	1	-	3.4
Conceptual gain	2	4	-	1	-	4.0
Practical gain	3	3	1	-	-	4.3

Comments: --I thought it was good because she didn't stick to an outline. I liked the "stories" best.

Table 4

GLORIA DOWNING'S PRESENTATION
(7 returns)

CATEGORY	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	MEAN
Organization	6	1	-	-	-	4.9
Content	7	-	-	-	-	5.0
Delivery	6	1	-	-	-	4.9
Materials	7	-	-	-	-	5.0
Conceptual gain	6	1	-	-	-	4.9
Practical gain	5	2	-	-	-	4.7

Comments: --I thoroughly enjoyed the participation. It was a good way to make a point (s).
--Excellent

Table 5

BARBARA LAVERY'S PRESENTATION
(6 returns)

CATEGORY	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	MEAN
Organization	1	3	2	-	-	3.8
Content	-	4	2	-	-	3.7
Delivery	2	2	2	-	-	4.0
Materials	-	2	4	-	-	3.3
Conceptual gain	-	2	4	-	-	3.3
Practical gain	1	1	4	-	-	3.5

Comments: --Games were intriguing.
--A lot of emphasis on games, even though she herself only spends one day a week on them.
--Very good.

III. TOTAL WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Results of the final summative evaluation of the Workshop follows in Table 6. (See appendix B for evaluation form used.)

Table 6

TOTAL WORKSHOP EVALUATION

	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	MEAN
1. Organization of the workshop	6	-	-	-	-	5.0
2. Content of the workshop	6	-	-	-	-	5.0
3. Delivery of the workshop	6	-	-	-	-	5.0
4. Materials (visuals, handouts, etc.)	6	-	-	-	-	5.0
5. To what extent did the workshop meet the stated objectives?	6	-	-	-	-	5.0
6. To what extent has your conceptual knowledge increased?	6	-	-	-	-	5.0
7. To what extent has your practical knowledge increased	5	1	-	-	-	4.8

Participants were asked to state what two things they considered strong points of the Workshop and what two things should have been done differently in the Workshop. Additional comments were also invited.

Strong Points

--Having participants involved in the kinds of activities that provided for the gifted. The small group.
--The facilitator and the sharing of ideas of workshop participants
--Anita Todd Parks. Group discussion.
--Amount of area covered. Degree to which persons were used.
--I enjoyed hearing different people speak. Different points of view and approaches. Lots of discussion--being allowed to digress.
--The variety of content. The preparedness, organization and delivery.

Should Have Been Done Differently/Suggestions for Improvement

--Have fruit instead of donuts.
--More time on creativity, non-academic skills/talents.

Additional Comments

--I was tremendously impressed with the G/T workshop.
  I can think of nothing that I would do differently.
--I really enjoyed the G/T workshop. It was a great experience.
--Not enough time. Just the tip of the iceberg. Spurred my interest.
--I feel Anita did a wonderful job as our leader. Her sensitivity and commitment to the gifted was highly exemplified. Also, the idea of including the community was great. Thank you for allowing me to participate.

APPENDIX A

Workshop Agenda
and
List of Participants

GIFTED AND TALENTED WORKSHOP

August 18-29, 1980
Mon.-Fri., 8:30-11:30 a.m.

Ypsilanti Central Community Bldg.
210 W. Cross, Ypsilanti

Monday, August 18

Group Information
Introductory Activities
Film: "Children of Promise"
Historical View of Gifted

Tuesday, August 19

Film: "It's Cool To Be Smart"
Defining Gifted and Talented
Characteristics of Gifted Children
Annemarie Roeper
Roeper City and Country School
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Wednesday, August 20

Film: "Rafe"
Historical View of Disadvantaged Gifted
Characteristics of Disadvantaged Gifted

Thursday, August 21

Identification: Test and Non-Test Measures
Gloria Downing, Gifted Consultant
Livingston Intermediate School District, Howell

Friday, August 22

General Principles of Gifted Education
Program Models for Gifted
Learning Styles/Teaching Styles: Mix or Match?

******

Monday, August 25

Creativity and the Gifted
Creative Problem Solving
Guilford's Structure of the Intellect

Tuesday, August 26

Instructional Strategies and the Gifted:
Bloom's Taxonomy
Critical Thinking
Inquiry Process

Wednesday, August 27

Program Options for Gifted Students
Barbara Lavery, Gifted Coordinator
Lincoln Consolidated School District, Ypsilanti

Thursday, August 28

An Overview of Project FOCUS
Cheryl Wilbanks, FOCUS Teacher
Ypsilanti Public Schools

Instructional Strategies and the Gifted
Taba Strategies
Synectics
Future Problem Solving

Friday, August 29

Wrap-Up and Evaluation
Film: "Why Man Creates"

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Patricia Forsberg-Smith. . . . . .George Elementary

Betty Jessee . . . . . .Adams Elementary

Sherry Quint . . . . . .East Middle

Ray Schultz. . . . . .Erickson Elementary

Yvonne Taylor. . . . . .Estabrook Elementary

Ernest Slater. . . . . .Director, Ypsilanti Boy's Club

Jerome Strong. . . . . .Ypsilanti City Councilman

Victoria Swanson . . . . . .Metropolitan Baptist Church

APPENDIX B

Assessment and Evaluation
Instruments

G/T STAFF DEVELOPMENT
Awareness Level - Assessment

CIRCLE the letter in front of the response that is most appropriate to your knowledge or feelings at this time.

1. Level of knowledge of the concepts of 'giftedness', i.e. definition, characteristics, identification

   A. I do not have any background in this area.
   B. I have a fair understanding, but I need to know more.
   C. I feel fairly confident of my understanding of the concepts.
   D. I have a strong background in the area of G/T.

2. Level of knowledge of the rationale (philosophy) for differentiated provisions for the education of gifted students

   A. I do not have any background in this area.
   B. I have a fair understanding, but I need to know more.
   C. I feel fairly confident of my understanding.
   D. I feel ready to support a particular philosophy regarding G/T.

3. Level of knowledge of ways to provide quality differentiated programs for gifted and talented students

   A. I do not have any background in this area.
   B. I have a fair understanding, but I need to know more.
   C. I feel fairly confident of my understanding.
   D. I have sufficient knowledge, and I feel ready to initiate some program elements.

4. Level of commitment to district-wide emphasis on provisions for gifted and talented students

   A. I do not have sufficient data for assessment at this time.
   B. I am not committed.
   C. I am open to the process and planning, but I am not committed.
   D. I am committed, but I still have some reservations.
   E. I am fully committed.

5. Level of commitment to specific provisions for gifted and talented students with whom I am directly or indirectly involved

   A. I do not have sufficient data for assessment at this time.
   B. I am not committed.
   C. I am open to the process and planning, but I am not committed.
   D. I am committed, but I still have some reservations.
   E. I am fully committed.

6. COMMENTS: _____

   _____

GD/AT:1978

Please respond to the following by checking (✓) the response that is most appropriate to your knowledge and feelings at this time.

	Little or no background	Have a fair understanding but need to know more	Feel fairly confident of my understanding	Have a strong background
Characteristics of the gifted				
Characteristics of disadvantaged gifted				
Methods of identifying gifted				
Creativity--what it is; how it can be fostered				
Bloom's Taxonomy				
Guilford's Structure of the Intellect				
Critical thinking				
Creative Problem Solving				
Taba Strategies				
Learning styles				
Teaching styles				
Renzulli's Enrichment Triad Model				

What do you expect to gain from this workshop? _____

_____

_____

SPEAKER EVALUATION FORM

CIRCLE the number which most closely describes your feelings on the scale of 5 to 1 with the descriptors given.

Excellent				Poor
5	4	3	2	1
Considerably				Very little

Speaker: _____

1.	Organization	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Content	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Delivery	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Materials	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Gain in conceptual knowledge	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Gain in practical knowledge	5	4	3	2	1

Comments: _____

_____

_____

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

CIRCLE the number which most closely describes your feelings on the scale of 5 to 1, with the descriptors given.

	Excellent				Poor
1. The organization of the workshop was:	5	4	3	2	1
2. The content of the workshop was:	5	4	3	2	1
3. The delivery of the workshop was:	5	4	3	2	1
4. The materials (visuals, handouts, etc.) used were:	5	4	3	2	1

	Considerably				Very Little
5. To what extent did the workshop meet the stated objectives?	5	4	3	2	1
6. To what extent has your conceptual knowledge increased?	5	4	3	2	1
7. To what extent has your practical knowledge increased?	5	4	3	2	1

8. What 2 things do you consider the strong points of the workshop?

9. What 2 things should have been done differently in the workshop?

10. Additional comments: